

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VIII

NEW YORK, JANUARY 23, 1915

No. 13

[Concluded from page 90]

The second feature is the broad upland to the north. This is formed of the same crystalline rock, but, instead of being worn away, it has been cut into sharp gorges and valleys. From a distance this plain has a level appearance, but on closer view the rough character is evident, and it becomes obvious that effective manoeuvring is impossible in such country.

The third feature is the sloping surface of the Paris Basin itself, where the horizontal chalk, limestone and sandstone layers come to the surface in sharp cliffs and escarpments that face the German guns. These cliffs have openings or river gaps of great strategic importance. The fourth, the Belgian plain, presents a surface that is admirable for the movement of massed troops.

the topography of these different regions has limited the Germans to four principal routes of invasion. The first is from Strassburg, in the Rhine Valley; thence over the Vosges or by way of the Belfort gateway into the Valley of the Saone, which is also formed by the dropping down of a longitudinal section of the earth's crust, and finally over the cliffs to Paris itself.

The Belfort gateway is the opening between the southern end of the Vosges and the Jura Mountains. In the middle of this opening, where the mountains narrow down to it on either side, is one of the strongest forts on the French frontier. It commands the entire valley and the routes of transportation. To mask it and pass around is difficult, if not impossible, on account of the inclosing hillsides.

The Germans have tried to take the Vosges, or, rather, to hurl men across them, but have been driven back with heavy losses.

The second route is from Coblenz by way of the Moselle Valley and then across the remaining cliff lines to Paris. That this has been one of the chief points of assault can be seen by the names of the towns in the dispatches and also by the term, The Army of the Moselle. The third route runs from Cologne by way of the Meuse Valley through the Ardennes in Belgium into France. But although the army sent by this route encountered a smaller number of cliffs, strong fortresses have had to be reduced. Liège and Namur blocked the way of the invading army, that could not pass and allow its lines of communication to be threatened by these great fortresses.

The fourth and the last route is from Cologne and Aix-la-Chapelle across the plains of Belgium, through Brussels and Mons to Northern France and thence by way of Cambrai and St. Quentin to Paris. This route is the one by which the Germans launched their main attack, and the advantages of the flat country that they encountered were considered by them to be greater than the disadvantages from violating the neutrality of Belgium and possibly bringing England into the war. The advantages remained in spite of the fact that this route is practically 50 per cent longer

from German territory to Paris than that of the Moselle Valley route from west of Metz to Paris. The actual distance is 385 kilometres in the first case, as opposed to 260 kilometres. Germany preferred the smoother route, although the choice involved longer lines of communication as well as the other evils already mentioned. She preferred it because its topography favored the swiftest advance of great armies and heavy artillery in the face of the enemy. She could doubtless have captured the Belfort gateway and sent in her army by the two routes that would have left Belgium unscathed. But the Russian menace was too imminent, in the opinion of her statesmen, to be tampered with by dilatory measures.

On all other routes there are to some extent the steep escarpments of the Paris Basin. While these cliffs would not appear particularly difficult to the eye of the civilian, we must remember that a gentle slope is a steep one to an army, while a steep slope is often utterly impassable. The French artillery at the top of the opposing cliffs can command the German line as it sweeps toward them on the plains. Even a rear guard action can be successfully fought out on top of one of these cliffs, while the bulk of the army retreats to the next cliff line. This strategic advantage is apparent in the dispatches, telling so frequently that the invaders had been driven back by the artillery on the heights.

Rivers have cut paths through these escarpments, but the gaps are for the greater part defended by powerful forts. In some cases the rivers have been diverted, leaving the gaps and the valleys. One prehistoric river cuts the valley that is filled by the St. Gond Marsh, now famous through the use it has been put to by General Joffre. When the Germans were at the height of their success they were led on by Joffre in such a way that, when it became necessary for them to fall back, their centre had to pass directly through this marsh, with the consequent loss of much of their artillery.

The Russian advance . . . into East Prussia is impeded by formidable natural obstacles on their right wing. Eastern Germany and Northwestern Russia have been overrun by glaciers that have left a series of marshes and lakes which are almost impassable in the rain. The lakes of East Prussia are one of the main defensive features of the country. On the south the Russians are pushing westward, using the Carpathian Mountains as a protection to their left flank.

When the allies push their armies into Germany they will have a problem as difficult as that which the Germans have encountered in their invasion of France.

Northern Germany is a plain like Belgium, but South Germany presents far more difficulty. If the French take Alsace, the Germans can fall back on the Black Forest and the region east of the Rhine gorge further north. The French then will be in exactly the same position as the Germans have been in the Vosges, with the necessity of storming the steep side of the Rhine Valley under the German artillery fire. Under these conditions a vigorous and effective defence

may be anticipated, which will do much to prolong the war.

The above quotations from the Tribune amply explain why Caesar's battlefields and those of the present struggle so often coincide. I may remark in conclusion that one of the most illuminating periods of work to me was the time I spent—several weeks—in careful study of the geography of Italy, in connection with a course on Roman Life. Here of special service was the volume on Italy in Stanford's elaborate work on European geography. One part of Müller's Handbuch, Dritter Band, Dritte Abteilung, is J. Jung's Grundriss der Geographie von Italien und dem Orbis Romanus⁸ (Munich, 1897). Of value bibliographically is Lübker, Reallexikon des Klassischen Altertums⁹ (Leipzig, 1914). Reference may be made also to A. Philippson, Das Mittelmeergebiet: Seine Geographische und Kulturelle Eigenart (Leipzig, 1904). The book deals with a wide variety of topics relating to the geology of the Mediterranean Basin (Chapters I–VI), Die Pflanzenwelt (Chapter VII), Die Landtiere (Chapter VIII), and Der Mensch (Chapter IX); it is illustrated by "9 Figuren im Text, 13 Ansichten, und 10 Karten auf 15 Tafeln". A book still of value, though antiquated now, is a Course in Ancient Geography, by H. I. Schmidt (D. Appleton and Co., 1877). One of the fortunate things in my preparatory school career was the fact that I was obliged to memorize large portions of this book. C. K.

THE PROSECUTION OF SEXTUS ROSCIUS

A Case of Parricide, with a Plea of Alibi and Non-motive

[Concluded from page 93]

The judiciary bill passed by Sulla in the year 81 had restored to the senators alone the right to serve on juries. Cicero compliments the personnel of the jury sitting on the case of Roscius, by telling them that they were chosen senators because of their good qualities, and that they were selected as *iudices* because of their strictness⁸⁸. Cicero elsewhere alludes to the change in the composition of juries effected by Sulla⁸⁹. The senators available for jury duty were divided into decuries, and a decury was assigned to a definite case. The number of jurors was then reduced by peremptory challenge to that appropriate to the case.

When the trial began, an opening speech was delivered by Erucius. In this he gave an outline of what he intended to prove by means of witnesses. He dwelt at length on the assumed motive of Roscius for committing the crime, and in general built up a case based almost wholly on circumstantial evidence. To this speech Cicero made reply in the oration we have. This is the one good opportunity the defense has, as we shall see later, to make a strong plea, and Cicero bends every effort to this part of the case.

After the attorneys had finished their initial statements, the taking of evidence for the prosecution began. The prosecutor, by means of questions, led the witness to tell his story, and then handed the witness over to the attorney for the defense for cross-examination. The prosecution could enforce the attendance of witnesses upon the trial, and could force them to testify. But no witness appeared for the defense, unless they chose voluntarily so to do. This is the most unjust part of a Roman criminal case. It places the defense at a frightful disadvantage. In the important case of Milo, Cicero does not mention, in the whole course of his lengthy speech, that a single witness for the defense was present or would give evidence, nor does Asconius do so in his Commentary on the speech, although he gives a long list of the witnesses for the prosecution. An exception appears in the speech for Archias. There Lucullus and representatives from Heraclea personally came to testify in behalf of the defendant. In the speech for Roscius Cicero does not hint that he will be able to call witnesses in favor of his client.

When the taking of evidence was completed, there were further speeches by the prosecution and the defense, devoted to an examination of the evidence. These speeches were, naturally, more technical than those delivered at the opening of the case, and for this reason would be of less general interest to the majority of readers. Here we have the explanation of the fact that very few of these second speeches of Cicero are preserved⁹⁰.

The attorney for the defense had a good opportunity to weaken the case for the prosecution in his cross-examination of witnesses, and in his final statement to the jury. He might show that the witnesses were so prejudiced that their evidence was untrustworthy⁹¹. For example, Cicero says that T. Roscius Capito is likely to give evidence against Sex. Roscius⁹², and asserts that he will so question Capito as to make it obvious that the past life of Capito was criminal and the evidence he was about to offer was perjured⁹³. He might show that the evidence was secured through bribery⁹⁴. But he could bring forward no witnesses to give a positive proof that his statements in court were true. Cicero asserts that Roscius did not kill his father with his own hand, for he was in Ameria at the time his father was killed in Rome⁹⁵. He endeavors to establish an alibi. Common justice would seem to grant the defense the right to produce some citizen, or citizens, of Ameria, who had seen the son at Ameria on that day, in order to prove the fact. Or, still better, the defendant himself would be allowed to take the stand in his own behalf. But the Roman law prohibited a man from giving evidence in his own

⁸⁸ qui ex civitate in senatum propter dignitatem, ex senatu in hoc consilium delecti estis propter severitatem.

⁸⁹ In Verrum 1. 13. 37 inter decem annos, posteaquam iudicia ad senatum translata sunt. Compare Tacitus, Ann. 11. 22.

⁹⁰ They are Pro Ponteio, Pro Placco, and Pro Scauro. The Fifth Verrine purports to examine evidence already presented, but it is not in point, as the speech was not actually spoken.

⁹¹ 103. ⁹² 102; 84.

⁹³ 101. Compare Digest 22.5.2–3.

⁹⁴ 30. ⁹⁵ 18.

case⁶⁰. The present situation, however, was a striking instance of one condition on which the slaves of Roscius might be questioned under torture. The present oration is the *locus classicus* on the matter. Slaves might be questioned concerning the killing of their master. If the slaves of Roscius the father were put to the torture, the fact might be elicited, either during direct questioning or on cross-examination, that the son was in Ameria at the time the father was murdered in Rome, and thus establish the alibi of the son. But a technicality here again met the defense, and prevented Cicero from using the slaves as witnesses. For the slaves, along with the rest of the property, had been sold and were now in the possession of Chrysogonus. And, of course, Chrysogonus refused to allow them to appear⁶¹.

Since the defense lay under such obvious disadvantage in regard to evidence, it is clear that the conviction or acquittal of the defendant must have depended almost entirely upon the skill of the attorney in his preliminary statement. Roman members of the bar recognized this situation, and, when several were retained for the defense, the most effective and experienced speaker was selected to give the lengthy plea in answer to the initial representation of the prosecutor.

We have only one genuine prosecutor's preliminary speech extant, namely, the first oration of Cicero against Verres. For sufficient reasons Cicero makes a much briefer speech in that case than was the custom. Consequently, it cannot be regarded as typical. It does not tell, for example, just what points the prosecution intends to prove. But it has one great characteristic which was probably typical of all such speeches. It mentions only in the most general way the nature of the evidence to be offered. It does not name individuals who are to give their evidence. Evidently the speech of Erucius against Roscius had the same characteristic, for Cicero is not sure just who the witnesses against Roscius will be. He had heard that Capito was likely to take the stand⁶² and he had heard of other witnesses, and that they were secured by means of bribery⁶³. But he is not sure that Erucius had even mentioned all the matter he has in mind to bring forward in evidence⁶⁴.

But Erucius had made clear his main line of evidence. He treated at some length the question of motive.

⁶⁰102: Itaque more maiorum comparatum est, ut in minimis rebus homines amplissimi testimonium de sua re non dicerent. Compare Digest 22.5.10 Nullus idoneus testis in re sua intellegitur.

⁶¹77-78: quod in tali crimine, quod innocentibus saluti solet esse, ut servos in quaestionem polliceantur, id Sex. Roscio facere non licet. Vos, qui hunc accusatis, omnis eius servos habetis. . . . Il servi ubi sunt? Chrysogonum, iudices, sectantur. . . . Dubitate etiam nunc, iudices, si potestis, a quo sit Sex. Roscius occisus, ab eone, qui propter illius mortem in egestate et insidiis versatur, cuine quaerendi quidem de morte patris potestas permittitur, an ab iis, qui quaestionem fugitant, bona possident, in caede atque ex caede vivunt. . . . Mortis paternae de servis paternis quaestionem habere filio non licet. Ne tam diu quidem dominus erit in suos, dum ex iis de patris morte quaeratur?

⁶²84: De Capitone post viderimus, si, quem ad modum paratum esse audio, testis prodierit.

⁶³30.

⁶⁴82.

involved in the killing of Roscius, and intended to prove that the son had a strong motive for committing the crime. That question concerns us here, not so much on account of the law on the topic, as on account of its value in indicating the nature of the pleadings permitted in a Roman court⁶⁵. Erucius had stated that the elder Roscius intended to disinherit his son⁶⁶. No reason is assigned for this, except that the father had no affection for the son, and even seemed to dislike him. This was evident from two circumstances. First, the father had the habit of taking his younger son with him wherever he went, but he kept the elder son on the farm⁶⁷. Second, the son never went to banquets with the father⁶⁸. Whatever may have been the cause of the estrangement, and the prosecution does not know the cause, it was certain that the son was not in favor of his father. The son, being indignant at the treatment he was receiving, planned revenge, and killed his father, or had him killed.

This is the charge which Cicero is called upon to answer, and his own answer must be conclusive, for, since he cannot call witnesses to his support, he must depend wholly upon his answer to the charge in order to secure the acquittal of his client. He does this in three ways.

First, he enters a general and emphatic denial of the accusation. Of course this is easy, and that is what is done merely by entering a plea of not guilty. It has been said that a Roman barrister could make such assertions for the defense as he chose, because he was not forced to prove them. But those who make this statement forget that he was likely to have his assertions disproved by the prosecution, and, if part of his plea fell in this way, the jurors would be likely to grant little credence to the rest. He was, therefore, compelled in his own interest to stick closely to the truth.

Secondly, he endeavors to show the inadequacy of the evidence presented by the prosecution. He shows that all the evidence is circumstantial, and "in circumstantial evidence every link in the chain must be perfect". No witness could be produced who had seen the defendant commit the crime⁶⁹. Nor could the prosecution prove that he had secured others to commit the deed. Much of the evidence was untrustworthy, because it was prejudiced or bribed. Then he dwells with great earnestness and apparent sincerity upon the enormity of the crime of parricide, and contends that the evidence must be irresistibly strong to warrant conviction. Many motives must be made to appear, a most profligate life on the part of the accused must be proved, extreme frenzy and madness must be present, and evident traces of the crime must exist⁷⁰. Unless the crime is proved in a manner almost visible, it is not credible⁷¹. The accused must have hated

⁶⁵The recent sensational trial of Madame Caillaux in Paris offers an interesting and instructive parallel.

⁶⁶52.

⁶⁷42.

⁶⁸52.

⁶⁹74: Quo modo occidit? ipse percussit an aliis occidendum dedit? Si ipsum arguis, Romae non fuit; si per alios fecisse dicis, quaero, servosne an liberos?

⁷⁰62.

⁷¹68.

his father, and feared punishment by the father⁷². None of these things was proved.

Thirdly, he shows where a motive for the crime really rested. Reverting to the ancient doctrine of Cassius, *cui bono*, he gives much attention to proving that Sex. Roscius would not profit by the crime, but that another would. This whole plea, which constitutes the most interesting feature of the speech, would be ruled out of an American or English court, on the ground that it is not strictly a defense of the defendant, but is an arraignment of one who is not on trial. Roman procedure allowed it, and it must be admitted that it offered a considerable offset to the disadvantage under which the defense suffered, of not being able to bring forward witnesses. Cicero seems to prove conclusively that Sex. Roscius had no motive for committing the crime, but that every motive pointed directly to Chrysogonus, Magnus, and Capito. The attack upon these three is very vigorous and fearless.

It is well known that Roscius was acquitted. Cicero claims, or boasts, that the case of the prosecution is so weak that they were in danger of being prosecuted for *calumnia* under the terms of the Lex Remmia⁷³. By this law one who engaged in a prosecution which was 'prompted by malice and conducted by fraud' had the letter K branded on his forehead.

We do not know by what majority of votes Roscius was acquitted, but it was a victory that won fame for Cicero. Plutarch says that Cicero incurred the ill-will of Sulla to such a degree that he found it advisable to leave Rome and travel in Greece for his health. The statement of Cicero is famous, that it has become a settled opinion in Rome, and among foreign nations, that in the courts of Rome at that time no wealthy man, however guilty, could be convicted⁷⁴. But this relates only to a wealthy man, who was able to bribe the jury. The situation of the poor man, like Roscius, who had no influence, was extremely hazardous and it reflects the very greatest credit upon Cicero that he was able to gain his case against the formidable influence of those who were virtually his accusers.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

R. W. HUSBAND.

REVIEWS

Hellenistic Athens¹. By William Scott Ferguson. New York: The Macmillan Company (1911). Pp. 487. \$4.00.

Mr. Ferguson is the first scholar who has made any attempt to gather into connected shape the story of Athens from the death of Alexander the Great to the end of the Pre-Christian era. The history of Athens during these three centuries is not that of a state with a constructive polity, or of any political

influence, but rather an account of the transformation of a small city-state into a municipality of a larger empire. This feature is perhaps less important and less vital than the fact that throughout these years Athens was the great University town of the Mediterranean district, and that her ancient political influence was transfused into an intellectual power which was even more far-reaching and permanent than the other.

The first three chapters deal with the years between the death of Alexander in 323 and the fall of Lachares in 294 B.C. There is abundant literary and epigraphical evidence for this period, which has been employed by earlier historians and writers of special topics. Whatever new material Mr. Ferguson has added has been gleaned from a careful study of the inscriptions, and the political changes at the close of the third century have been set forth with more exactness than hitherto. The end of the Hellenic or Lamian War marked the beginning of instability in the Athenian constitution. During the next seventy-five years oligarchy, tyranny, and democracy of all sorts followed in bewildering succession. It is especially difficult to follow the democracy which, like a weather-cock, veered to every point of the compass according as Macedon, Epirus, the Ptolemies, or the Seleucids bought or won the support of Athens.

While the political life of the city was in such a state of flux, the moral life of the people was in far worse case—but unfortunately not liable to changes for the better. There is this curious difference between the ancient and modern world—the uplift of women in ancient days came from that class which modern society is now trying to lift up. Much of our information about the society of that time is gathered from the comedians of the day, whom we should not take too seriously, realizing that the comic stage then as now was not a necessary portrayal of prevalent social conditions.

Mr. Ferguson relies largely on the results of his own researches in the epigraphical documents in constructing the history of the third century. To him we owe the law of the secretary-cycle by which order has given place to chaos in dating the inscriptions. But there are possibilities of disturbances in the cycle at all times; whether in the confusion of party strife during the first half of the century, he has made allowance for all of these remains to be seen. Ferguson and Kirchner assume no breaks in the cycle between 302 and 262 B.C. Kolbe, Pomtow and Tarn have attacked this arrangement, assuming several disturbances but without being able to explain them satisfactorily, and their objections therefore have not received general support. We may never attain final accuracy because of the conflicting nature of the evidence, but, when it is so difficult to reconcile our limited literary tradition with the evidence of inscriptions as dated by Mr. Ferguson, we must ponder long before we can accept or discard either. There must be some solution which lies between the rigidity of the present cycle and the

⁷²68.

⁷³55:57.

⁷⁴In Verrem I.1.1.

¹Since this book was written, so much investigation has been carried on in various portions of the period which Mr. Ferguson discusses, that a reviewer has an unfair advantage in offering his criticism. I therefore content myself at this late day with a summary of the book, indicating one or two only of the major problems which are still open to controversy.

disorder of those constructed by its critics. When this is found, the history of Athens for the early third century may be entirely rewritten.

From 295 to 262 B.C. the succession of political parties at Athens in control of the government is most bewildering. Mr. Ferguson outlines the various changes as follows. First there was a coalition government which gradually became anti-Demetrian, but was saved from going too far by the recall of the exiles. In 290 B.C. the city was thoroughly pro-Demetrian, changing in the following year to an extreme democracy affiliated with Lysimachus and Ptolemy. The situation at Athens after the death of Lysimachus is not clearly defined, but apparently the city was independent with Seleucid affiliations while Phaedrus, a moderate pro-Antigonid, was in a position of trust and influence. Phaedrus was followed by Glaucon and Chremonides, seemingly moderate at this time, and only later becoming extremists of the democratic party. In 276 a limited democracy friendly to Antigonos came into power. In 274 Athens was neutral, friendly to Pyrrhus and Antigonos. In the following year the radical democrats subsidized by Egypt became prominent though they did not dominate the state, and we have the remarkable picture of a pro-Macedonian and pro-Egyptian party living in apparent amity for some six or seven years. In 266 Athens definitely cast in her lot with Ptolemy and asserted her independence of Macedon. This act precipitated the Chremonidean war and for five years Athens strove to beat back the armies of Antigonos. In March 261 B.C. the city surrendered to the invader and for a generation was a part of the kingdom of Macedon. In the midst of all this turmoil of change any one seeking for an explanation of disturbances of the secretary-cycle should find difficulty only in selection.

In the years which followed the Chremonidean War Athens was transformed from a city-state to a municipality of the empire of Macedon. A certain measure of democracy was granted after 256 B.C. but the public assemblies no longer controlled the destinies of the people. Athens naturally took no part in the development of the various leagues and federations which were becoming so important a political factor in Greece. From 261 to 229 B. C. the main interest is centered in the history of these various federations and the struggle for the supremacy of the Aegean between Antigonos and Ptolemy. During these years the prominence of the philosophic schools at Athens compensated in some degree for her loss of political power.

When Athens gained her independence, her foreign policies were directed by Eurycleides and Micion, who established friendly relations with all the Mediterranean nations. In the second century the fidelity of the democracy to Rome, which established a virtual protectorate over the city, won in return for Athens a long era of peace and the restoration of part of her

ancient empire. In this new empire, if we can call it such, the center of political interest shifts from the mother-state to the chief dependency, the island of Delos.

The destruction of Corinth and the extension of Roman interests in Asia led to an extraordinary development of Delos as a trade center. The island far surpassed the mother state in economic importance and the administration of the affairs of this colonial possession became the most vital political problem in Athens. Gradually, however, Roman influence encroached upon Athenian, and the control of the government finally passed into the hands of the Italian settlers on the island. When Corinth was rebuilt new trade routes were established and the decline of Delos was as sudden as its rise.

While the administration of the affairs of Delos brought its problems, the development of religious and philosophic thought seems to have been the most vital matter in Athenian life. In the last century of the Pre-Christian era the Areopagus regained some of its old powers, and other constitutional changes were made. The prevailing note of the first quarter of this century is the gradual encroachment of Rome, and the growth of a party which resented her assertions and aspired to independence. The success of Mithridates won the people over to the side of the nationalist party and, when the king promised his assistance, they definitely declared against Rome. The wretched story of the siege of Athens by Sulla and his treatment of the city on its surrender is well known. Henceforward Athens was only a little University town in a great empire.

Such is a brief summary of the book. Any criticism of minor points is overshadowed by the evidence on every hand of sound scholarship and careful research. The numerous footnotes show plainly how thoroughly the author was conversant with everything which concerned his work, and, even if we may disagree with the author's interpretation of certain periods, we are confident that all historians who venture into this field must first reckon with Mr. Ferguson's account of Hellenistic Athens.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

Athens, *The Violet-Crowned*. By Lilian Whiting. Boston: Little, Brown and Company (1913). Pp. xii + 361. \$2.50.

This is a beautiful book, beautifully printed and beautifully bound, with an excellent illustration of the Parthenon on the outside and with thirty-six fine plates from photographs inside. The author is a well-known Boston lady, who has written some twenty other books, including works on Boston, Florence, Italy, Paris, and the Brownings. She has evidently spent some time in Athens; indeed, she wrote this book in Athens. She knows the names of many archaeologists, such as Schliemann and Waldstein, from both of whom, but

especially from the latter, she quotes much—often inaccurately.

It is evident that Miss Whiting is no archaeologist, and it would not be worth while to review her book for *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, if it did not contain some very amusing errors, which should be recorded along with the interesting philological mistakes which students make in their translation of Latin and Greek.

One page (79), with regard to the sculptures of the Parthenon, is a classic. According to this, it would seem that the Venus of Melos, the Victory of Samothrace, the Phigalean frieze, the Harpy tomb, and many other sculptures came from the Parthenon, together with a metope from Selinus in Palermo, which is ascribed to Silenus—a new Greek sculptor, as interesting as the sculptor Kallipygos created by the late Professor Eaton of Yale in his abridged translation of Friedrich's *Bausteine*, and as the painter Attalus created by Miss Weir in her *Greek Painter's Art* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 1.230), or as the sculptor Milo suggested by the tourist looking at the Venus di Milo.

Let me point out a few of the many other errors¹. I shall confine myself in the main to errors touching classical matters. On pages 12, 66, 182, 343, 344 Delphi is confused with the capital of India and so is called Delhi. On page 42 the Olympieum is said to have been founded by Pisistratus about 530 B.C., completed by Hadrian, and consecrated four hundred years after its beginning. That would put Hadrian's visit in 130 B.C. instead of 130 A.D. On page 55 occurs the remarkable mistake of putting the Tower of the Winds in the region of the monument of Lysicrates. How could anyone who has been in Athens make such a statement? The tower is twenty-six feet in diameter, not twenty-seven in circumference; it was not surmounted by eight figures, and Andronicus the builder came from Cyrrhus in Syria, not from Cyrrhus in Macedonia. On page 60 Theseus is called a god, and the temple of Theseus (wrongly so called) is characterized as the purest example of the Doric design (nothing is said about the Parthenon). The roof of the temple is not intact, as the author states, but has been replaced by a barrel-vault. On page 63, while Miss Whiting admits that "the severest of the archaeologists hold a doubt as to whether" the so-called prison of Socrates is the actual scene of his imprisonment, she is certain that she has beheld there the very spot of that imprisonment. Nearly, if not quite all, archaeologists hold that this is not a prison but part of an ancient two-story house. On page 66 we are told that the National Museum is not interesting, not the usual verdict, even of tourists, and Miss Whiting herself admits elsewhere that Dr. Schliemann's collection of Mycenaean antiquities, by which she seems to mean the Mycenaean room in the National Museum, is of

interest. Nor does Miss Whiting know that Greece is full of important local museums, as at Sparta, Corinth, Epidauros, Chaeronea, Volo, etc. On page 68 we have Socrates buried in the Dipylon, and "here is pointed out the tomb of Pericles, now in process of excavation, and of Euripides". Who pointed these out to Miss Whiting? No archaeologist has seen them, so far as I know. Pages 92-93 are almost as delightful as page 79. Here we learn that the seats of the theater, which is called an amphitheater, are marble chairs rising tier above tier, where two thousand spectators could listen to the masterpieces of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. There were only two marble tiers, and the theater would seat about 17,000; and the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles could not have been played in this stone theater, which was not erected till about 330 B.C. We learn that "the theater was decorated, in the days of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Aristophanes, with statues of the leading tragic and comic poets, the pediments of which are still intact and bear the names of the poets represented". This is not true of Aeschylus, and pediments cannot be used for pedestals. We learn (93) that even the diminutive stage still exists, supported by sculptures of the days of Aeschylus and Euripides; but the stage preserved belongs to the third century A.D., and the sculptures date from the early Roman Empire. On page 136 it is stated that four different sets of people occupied Hissarlik, the site of Troy, and Schliemann's theory is adopted that the second nation was the Homeric Trojans, whereas in truth there were nine strata, and the sixth stratum was the Homeric city. On pages 144, 146, 153, we have the extraordinary error of transference of the Lion Gate (which is said to establish the fact that there was an Agamemnon) from Mycenae to Tiryns. On page 230 we read that Theocritus is "peculiarly difficult to fairly represent, as out of his Idyls only some thirty fragments survive". On page 251 we are told that "On Ithaca all the sites of the Odyssey are absolutely discovered, according to the convictions of the discoverers, who, being Dr. Schliemann and Sir William Gell, hold undisputed authority; even the stone looms used by the nymphs are in actual existence, so one's illusions need not be drawn upon there; reality may be substituted". Surely all the sites of the Odyssey are not located on Ithaca, and what about Dörpfeld's theory that Leukas is Ithaca? In connection with Olympia we have mentioned (344) the Vale of Tempe and Mt. Olympus, and the statement that the utter desolation of the mountainous solitudes about Olympia makes it easy to believe that only the gods could inhabit them. "On this Olympian height all human vision was quickened and purified" (345). "Leaving this wonderful place, descending the mountain again, one feels that the great god Pan is left behind" (346). How can one who has travelled in Greece possibly confuse Olympia in the plain of Elis with Mt. Olympus in Thessaly, although I heard a well-known minister make the same mistake the

¹There is no space to note the innumerable misprints, especially in proper names, such as "Phoenician" for "Phaeacian" (103, 248), "Socrates" for "Sophocles" (330), etc.

other day in a public sermon? Moreover the altar of Zeus at Olympia is not the altar of Zeus (346), but prehistoric elliptical houses, nor are there any remains of a palace of Nero (346).

There are very many more errors than those I have mentioned, but these are enough to show how inaccurate the book is. To the man who knows something about Greece, however, the book will be worth its price, for the reader will get two dollars and a half worth of fun and pleasure out of it; and we must remember that the author herself says (63) that she is "not an archaeologist, or a person in any way inconveniently encumbered with learning". As she says, "a too great doubting capacity is eminently unsuited to extracting the greatest possible amount of pleasure and interest out of one's transatlantic wanderings", and too much learning has certainly not been a drawback to Miss Whiting's enjoyment in antiquities. On page 249 she says that an encyclopedia and an atlas will supply knowledge anywhere, but to get the most out of one's saunterings one wants to believe in the impossible. We must reply that no encyclopedia furnishes sufficient knowledge about Athens and Greece to enable one to write an accurate book on the subject, but we must confess that the author believes in the impossible. Let no one, moreover, think that this book, full of quotation and repetition, confines itself to Athens, as a list of the chapters will show: Athens, the Violet-Crowned, Saunterings and Surprises, The Acropolis, The Eleusinian Mysteries, The Story of Dr. Schliemann (with much quotations from his works), The Archaeological Schools in Athens, Greek Sculpture and Philosophy, Contemporary Literature in Greece, Ethical Poetry of Greece, The Charm of Corfu, The Royal Family of Greece (a very good chapter), The Progress of Greece, The First Century of Greek Independence.

This reviewer is not eager to deprive the inoffensive tourist of his legitimate joys, but it is written with the firm belief that even the ordinary layman, to say nothing of the visitor to Athens, prefers not to be misinformed.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. DAVID M. ROBINSON.

The Latin Ladder. By Robert W. Tunstall. New York: The Macmillan Company (1913). Pp. xiv + 290. Five illustrations and map. 90 cents, net.

To the many 'Gates', 'Bridges', 'Straight Roads' to Caesar, and other seductive short-cuts to the desired knowledge of Latin which have appeared in recent years is added now The Latin Ladder, by Mr. Robert W. Tunstall, of the Tome School for Boys, at Port Deposit, Maryland.

In a novel preface, which consists in part of quotations from various classical worthies, Mr. Tunstall lays down his articles of faith: (1) that the work of the first year in Latin is the most important in all the preparatory course; (2) that the paramount matter in the first year is inflection; (3) that inflection is

best taught by emphasizing from the beginning the significance of stem and ending; (4) that inherent interest in the subject-matter must be stimulated by the reading lessons which reward the beginner for his preparatory toil.

To accomplish these ends, which do not differ so very much from the aims of most beginners' books, the Ladder is divided into three parts. Part I, intended to "orient" the pupil, contains the following material, developed very slowly, and spread thin over twenty-one lessons: (1) the indicative active and passive of the four conjugations (including deponent verbs), and the indicative of *sum*—all in the third person only; (2) nouns of the first and simpler nouns of the second declension, together with adjectives similarly inflected: also an introduction to the third declension; (3) three pronouns used in three cases only; (4) a few common prepositions treated in some detail; (5) a chapter on the order of words in Latin, with illustrative selections for reading; and (6), at the end of Part I, a summary of the fifteen rules of syntax employed in the preceding lessons.

Part II, the main body of the book, presents forms and syntax in alternate chapters. In the chapters on syntax, questions leading up to the composition work and followed by illustrative sentences in Latin form a catechism on the principles given in Part III. Every fifth chapter in Part II is a reading lesson. Every seventh chapter is followed by a series of review questions. The reading lessons throughout the book consists of continuous narrative, and in Part II are based on Viri Romae and the Helvetian War.

Part III contains a systematic presentation of the principles of syntax, to be used for reference in Part II, and for convenience in review work if needed. This forms a valuable addition to the main body of the book and contains several excellent chapters, especially those treating of the gerund and the gerundive and indirect discourse. The Latin examples, as well as the sentences for translation, are in general well chosen. The illustration given for the genitive is, perhaps, an exception to the rule, being really a genitive of material.

The vocabularies are chosen with great care from Professor Lodge's book, The Vocabulary of High School Latin. Vocabulary reviews come at regular intervals throughout the book, with a final word-list of five hundred and three words to be mastered.

On the whole the Ladder contains much that is pleasing. The slow development of the earlier lessons will doubtless be a boon to many, and the great amount of explanation, generally left to the teacher, will be a blessing to the inexperienced or the poorly equipped. The resulting irregularity in the length of chapters, which vary from a page and a half to nine pages, might be objected to, but the chapters are punctuated by exercises at fairly regular intervals, so that they may be divided into lessons of average length. Another result of the unusually large amount of explanatory matter is a certain crowded appearance

of the page. The attractiveness of the volume could be greatly increased by a more open arrangement and, in some cases, by the use of larger type, though that would add something to the size of a book already large enough. The book is marred by a great number of minor typographical errors, which a later edition will doubtless correct.

ROXBURY LATIN SCHOOL.

CLARENCE W. GLEASON.

Readings in Greek History. By Ida Carleton Thallon. Boston: Ginn and Company (1914). Pp. xxix + 638. \$2.00.

In spite of a fairly marked tendency away from the indiscriminate use of sources in history teaching, source-books continue to be published. Miss Thallon's Source-book in ancient history is the most elaborate, is intended for the most mature students, and is, with a single exception, the most scholarly. No book equals it in the use of the inscriptions or of the writers on geography, while the large number of selections from the orators is another welcome novelty. The work of selecting has been well done and the work can scarcely be bettered—if we admit the validity of the principles according to which the book has been constructed.

Most source-books in ancient history are rather over the head of the child fresh from the grades. This is naturally all the more true of our book since its very excellencies are of a type too mature for many a college Freshman. It will scarcely be used in Freshman classes in general ancient history, for there are no parallel source-books for the Oriental and Roman history, and, if there were such books, the total cost of the outfit would be prohibitive. Its use will, therefore, in all probability, be confined to those institutions where a separate course in General Greek history is given to classes above the Freshman year.

Even here it will not be found entirely satisfactory. We may assume that the student who takes such a course has already carried on other College work in history and has become accustomed to doing collateral reading. Teachers in ancient history are exceptionally fortunate in having so much source-material, attractive in form and easily accessible, which may be substituted for the secondary works which instructors in other fields of history are forced to assign. Even in the Freshman year in High School, it has been found possible to supplement or supplant the source-book by fairly extensive readings from Homer, Herodotus, and Plutarch. Not the least gain has been the discovery that our better students would read far beyond the designated limits. With all the more force will this apply to our students of College rank, for surely they are capable of solving elementary source-problems.

Taking into consideration the fact that such outside readings must be assumed for the College class, it is surprising to find that almost half the readings in our source-book are taken from Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Plutarch, writers whose complete works we can buy in cheap translations for but little more than the cost of the Readings. This over-use of Herodotus and Thucydides is in large measure due to the over-emphasis of the Persian and the Peloponnesian Wars. The latter period, particularly, does not deserve a quarter of the space in the book, even though we do now and then hear of matters not directly connected with the war.

The most serious obstacle, however, to the use of this book in classes is the omission of all that happened after Chaeronea. More and more we are emphasizing the Hellenistic Age, more and more we feel the need of source-materials for our classes. We have translations, enough and to spare, for the period before Chaeronea. But who will compile for us a collection of the inscriptions and the papyri without which our study of the Hellenistic Age is but an unsatisfactory attempt? From the practical standpoint of the teacher, this is the most needed bit of work yet undone.

Yet it is ungracious to criticise Miss Thallon for not doing something which she has specifically declared was not in her intention. Nevertheless, she had done her work so well within her self-designated limits that we cannot but regret that she did not follow other and broader lines. It is our loss that we cannot, for practical reasons, use her book in our teaching of ancient history.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

A. T. OLMSTEAD.

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The next meeting of The New York Latin Club will be held on Saturday, February 6, at the Washington Irving High School, 16th Street and Irving Place, New York City.

Professor Talcott Williams, Head of the School of Journalism, Columbia University, will speak on Latin Studies in the United States.

Members are kindly requested to meet in the Foyer Hall at 11.30, that the luncheon may begin promptly at 12 noon.

Tickets for guests at this luncheon may be procured at 75 cents apiece.

Classical teachers in New York and its vicinity who have not yet joined the Club are earnestly urged to do so. \$2.25 will cover the dues for the current year and the two remaining luncheons (February 6 and April 10). Apply for membership to W. F. Tibbetts, Curtis High School, New Brighton, New York.